

(5)

THE
DOCTRINE
OF THE
Holy Trinity,
AND THE
DIVINITY
OF THE
Blessed JESUS,
EXPLAIN'D,

According to the [*Sense*] of the
HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Wherein the *Notions* of the TRINITY,
held by such CREED-MAKERS, who
call themselves [*Orthodox,*] are prov'd
to be *false, impious, and heretical,* disa-
greeing, and contrary to the Doctrine of
the *Catholick Church,* and especially that
of the *Church of ENGLAND.*

Being a full ANSWER to certain
Articles of HEREST, charg'd against
a Member of a *Dissenting Congregation.*

LONDON, Printed for J. Moore, near St.
Paul's Church-Yard. 1719. (Price 6d.)

THE
DOCTRINE

OF THE

DIVINITY

OF JESUS

CHRIST

AND

OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

IN THE

TRINITY

BY

JOHN CALVIN

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME THE FIRST

LONDON

Printed by J. B. ROBERTSON

T O T H E

READER.

IT need not be told, That the present *Contentions* in religious *Matters*. and particularly touching *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, is the Occasion of the revival of the following *Tract*, which was publish'd a great many Years since, and seems to have a great deal in it applicable to the *Circumstances* of many, who are now Sufferers under the same unchristian Treatment.

As to the Argumentative Part, I shall say nothing, it being Wrote with such a manifest Plainness and Sincerity of Heart, as cannot but Convince all Persons, who may think him mistaken, of the Integrity of the Man. *Truth* stands in need of very little *Art*, and looks

as decent in the following plain Pages, as in much more laboured Dresses.

Some *Circumstances* of the *Author*, it may not be improper to inform the *Reader* of. He was a wealthy, honest *Citizen*, but happen'd to be upon the decline in his Substance when this *Heresy* was first found upon him, by a *Congregation* to which he belonged, meeting in *Barbican*. At the same time, Alderman *Bristow* was dealt with, and *Excluded* by a *Congregation* in *Spittle-Fields*, for the very same *Tenets*; whereupon he offer'd himself to the *Communion* of the fore-mention'd *Orthodox Congregation* in *Barbican*, and was by them received.

I leave the *Reader* to draw what *Inferences* he pleases from this Relation, and recommend to him the serious, unprejudic'd Perusal of the following *Traët*, on the Assurance that it may Please many, but can Offend none that have the Temper of Men and Christians.

THE



THE
DOCTRINE
OF THE
Holy Trinity,
EXPLAIN'D, &c.



Beloved Brethren, I have been a Member of your Congregation 30 Years, or more ; and I enter'd into it upon these Principles : (1st) *That the Holy Scriptures were written by inspired Persons, and therefore did not contain any Contradictions, nor Errors.* (2.) *That all Things necessary to be Believ'd,*

or

or Practic'd, in order to Salvation, were so expressly, or plainly read or found therein, that every sincerely enquiring Man, might easily know and be convinc'd of them. (3.) That it was the Duty of every Member, to give Diligence to know the Father, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent, and to communicate in this Knowledge and Acknowledgment with one another ; thus to build up one another in our most holy Faith.

Touching my honest and religious Behaviour among you, and towards all Men, I appeal to every one in particular, I am not conscious that I have offended against any of the aforesaid Principles : Nay, I hope it will appear to all impartial Considerers, that the Occasion I have given for a *Charge*, which some of you have drawn up against me, is only my pursuing those Principles ; but the Freedom they have taken so to do, (as I have sufficient Reason to believe, arises from some worldly Considerations.

It's well known to you all, (at least all of the Party who Prosecute me) that of late Years there has been a hot Dispute among learned Men, concerning *The Doctrine of the Unity of GOD, and the holy Trinity* ; and after many Books publish'd upon that Subject, wherein the Clergy
of

of the *Church of England*, as well as the *Dissenters*, were at great Variance one with another ; one Party maintaining, That the three Divine Persons of the *Trinity*, were three Spirits, Minds, or Substances, of the same Nature one with another. The other Party asserting them to be but one Spirit, Mind, or Substance. Each of these Parties challenges the *Catholick Church*, and *Church of England*, to be of their Mind and Judgment, and imputes gross *Heresy* to each other mutually.

At length, by a Sermon preach'd at the University of *Oxford*, the Learned Mr. *Vice-Chancellor*, and *Heads of Colleges*, and *Halls* there, in a general Meeting, *Novemb. 25. 1695.* Judg'd, Declar'd, and Decreed these Propositions, viz. [*There are three Infinite and distinct Minds, and Substances in the Trinity.*] Item, *That the Three Persons in the Trinity, are three distinct infinite Minds, or Spirits, and three individual Substances,*] are False, Impious, and Heretical, disagreeing and contrary to the Doctrin of the *Catholick-Church*, and especially to the Doctrin of the *Church of England*.

Now, I appeal to every one in particular, how I, knowing this, could be unconcern'd, and not determine with my self,

self, which of these Parties had the Truth in a Matter of the highest Importance ? Would that consist with my Duty to the true God, with my Care for my own eternal Salvation, or the christian Love I owe to our Society ? And indeed, having long been resolv'd by reading the Holy Scripture, which doth expressly declare, that *God is a Spirit* ; and in many Texts, that he is *One*, and throughout, in a thousand plain Texts, speaks of Him, as of *one Spirit*, or *real Person* : I thought it my Duty to declare my Mind in this Matter, and to propagate this great Truth. Hence it is, that my Brethren have thought fit to Charge me with, not only holding, but zealously endeavouring to propagate the following Errors contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and the receiv'd Principles of this Church, to the great Scandal and Offence thereof ; *viz.*

1st. Denying the Deity of the Lord *Jesus Christ*, and of the *Holy Spirit*, (or that they are of the same Nature with the Father) and affirming them to be only *Creatures*.

2^{dly}. Denying our *Pre-existence* of the Redeemer, before his Incarnation ; affirming, he had no actual or personal Being, till he was conceiv'd in the Womb of the Virgin.

3. Deny-

3. Denying the Doctrine of the blessed Trinity, in the Unity of the God-head, as generally receiv'd by Christians.

4. Frequently shewing an unbecoming and irreverent Behaviour in publick Worship, when Divine Glory has been ascrib'd to the *Son* and *holy Spirit*, together with the *Father*.

Hereupon they *Suspended me*, (as they call it) from the *Communion of the Society*, which I take to be but a softer Word for *Excommunication*. They gave me this *Charge* in Writing, and Time to make *Answer* to it ; but when I brought in my *Answer*, and requir'd to be heard to read it, they at first refus'd, though afterwards they gave Leave ; but in the Introduction to my Defence, when I said, *I doubt not but to shew, that what you call Errors, contrary to the Scriptures, are the real plain Truths of the Gospel*, they cry'd out, *I confess'd the Charge, they would hear no more.*

Here my christian Brethren refus'd to hear me Answer to a *Charge* of Errors contrary to the Scriptures, which is a denial of common and natural Justice, whereby every Man is allow'd to be heard, and to make his Defence.

And yet the *Charge* it self is so far Unscriptural, as that it is drawn,

1st, In Unscriptural Terms. And,

2^{dly}, In such Terms, as our Church never agreed on, as the *Sense* of *Scripture* necessary to be believed.

3^{dly}, Terms capable of ambiguous Meaning.

4^{thly}, Of no determinate Meaning, but general, and uncertain.

5^{thly}, Scholastick Terms, not understood by common *English* Readers.

And lastly, Terms that assert such *Propositions*, as are (I conceive) Decreed by the learned University of *Oxford*, to be False, Impious, and Heretical.

If I be mistaken in these Things, ought not my Brethren to have heard me, and rectify'd me ? Was it not the very End and Design of our gathering together into a christian Society, that we might, as Brethren, and Members of one Body, be assistant to one another, in the Way to eternal Bliss ? But instead of that, when you judg'd that one of your Members was so corrupted, that he was no longer to be retain'd, you will not so much as hear him in his own Defence, but catch at a Word, and condemn him Right or Wrong ; and so let him Die, and Perish eternally in his Corruption.

Doth

Doth any civil Society, doth any common Judicature deal in this manner ?

Thus have I been treated (my Brethren) by Part of our Church, led by two or three arrogant Politicians, from whom an antient Brother might have expected kinder Usage, or at least, common Justice ; which since they have thought fit to refuse me, I am forc'd to *Appeal* to every one of You in particular, and hope you will hear me, if not *as a Brother*, yet, at least, as one who may deserve your Pity, that ought not to be so treated. For, am I unfit to be heard, because I will not confess my christian Faith in such Terms as are not found, neither in Holy Scripture, the only *Protestant Rule of Faith*, nor in any of the three *Creeds*, or Summaries of Faith, that are acknowledg'd by most Christians in these Western Parts of the World ?

The first Article of their *Charge* against me is, *My Denying the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, (or that they are of the same Nature with the Father) and affirming them to be only Creatures.*

To this Article I answer, I solemnly profess to believe all and every Thing
B 2 that

that is written in the Holy Scriptures, concerning our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and that in the most religious Sense I am capable of. More particularly,

First, I acknowledge that *Christ* is so God, as that it pleased the Father, that in him should all Fulness dwell; Col. 1. 19. And, In him dwells the Fulness of the God-Head bodily, Col. 2. 9.

Secondly, That he is so God, that God saith unto him, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever. And, Thy God hath anointed thee with the Oyl of Gladness above thy Fellows, Heb. 1. 8, 9.

Thirdly, That he is so God, as he is the Son of God; He whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the World. For, (saith he, in Answer to the Calumny of the Jews, who said, that by calling God his Father, in a peculiar manner, he made himself God) if he called them Gods, to whom the Word of God came.— Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God? John, 10. 30, 33, 35, 36. I take this Answer of Christ, to be a plain Denial of his being God in the Sense of the

the *Jews*, and as plain a Confession that he was God in the *Sense* of the Text he cited out of the 82d Psalm, to wit, *By the Father's sanctifying and sending him, by the Father's dwelling in him.*

But this *Confession* of the Deity of the Lord Jesus, will not satisfy my Brethren, I am accused of holding Errors contrary to the Holy Scriptures, when I do deny their Comment, which manifestly is not in Scripture: Yea, is indeed, so far as I can understand it, contrary to Scripture. However, I must, it seems, confess, that *Christ is of the same Nature with the Father.* But what must I now do to know the Meaning of this Phrase, *The Father is a Spirit, and the Father of Spirits; and he is the Father of our Lord Jesus, who is a quick'ning Spirit.* Here then we find two Spirits, the Father and the Son, and the Son must be of the same Nature with the Father: That is to say, as the *Father* is an almighty Spirit, the Son must also be an almighty Spirit; as the *Father* is only Good, or Good in the highest Sense, so must the Son be also; as the *Father* is an all-knowing Spirit, so must the Son be also.

I persuade my self, that this is the *real Meaning* of my Brethren. Now, I think, I shall prove clearly, from *Christ's* own Words, That he denies himself to
be

be of the same Nature with his Father in *this Sense* ; and then, I hope, it's no Error against Scripture, to deny what *Christ* himself in Scripture denies.

I have shewn already, from *John* the 10th, and *Christ's* Answer to the *Jews*, who charg'd him, That he made himself God, or another Almighty with the Father, that he denies it as a *Calumny* he gave no Ground for ; and that he was God, or the Son of God, in quite another Sense ; for I dare not think that he deluded the *Jews*. But let us now see what *Christ* Answers to the like Charge, because he had wrought a Miracle in making whole an impotent Man on the Sabbath-Day, and also said, that God was his Father, the *Jews* charged him, that he made himself equal to God. To which he Answers with an Affe-
ration, which admits not of any hidden Meaning, saying, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do : The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth. — The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, that all Men shall Honour the Son even as they Honour the Father that sent him. — I can of my self do nothing, John 5. 19, 22, 23. 30.*

By

By Nothing here, and in the 19th Ver. I understood no divine and miraculous Work; and that is a solemn and plain Denial of himself to be God, in the sense of absolute Equality with God, as a second Spirit, or Substance of the same Almighty Nature of the Father: And I think these Sayings cannot be understood to consist with his being so, without the highest Reflection upon his Veracity, and his Love to God or Men.

If I am in so great an Error as that my Brethren impute to me, I hope they will convince me, that I may be of the same Mind with them, without such horrid Reflections.

Like unto this, is that Saying in *John* 7. 16, 17, 18. *My Doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me.* And, *If any one will do his Will, he shall know of the Doctrine, whether it be from God, or whether I speak of my self.* Where we see God and himself are oppos'd, which could not be Truth, if he himself were God, or of the same Nature, in the same Sense with Him that sent him.

Again he saith, *John* 8. 28. *When ye shall lift up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of my self, but as the Father hath taught me, I speak these things.* And, *Chap.* 12. 49, 50. *I have not spoken of*
my

my self, but the Father that sent me, he gave me a Commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. And John 7. My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. And Chap. 12. 44. He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And Chap. 14. 10. The Words that I speak, I speak not of my self, but the Father that abideth in me, he doth the Works.

If the Son be not the prime Author of his Doctrine, but the Father ; and if the miraculous Works which he did, were done not by him as the Principal, nor by any other Divine Spirit, or Person, dwelling in his Manhood, but by the Father abiding in him : If he did nothing of himself, but as the Father taught him ; then would I gladly be inform'd, by my Brethren, how to satisfy my Conscience, in contradicting our Lord, and telling him in effect, *Lord, thou art of the same Nature with thy Father ; an almighty Person, or Spirit, as well as He ; Thou art the principal Agent in the miraculous Works that thou didst ; Thou canst do all things of thy self, as well as the Father ; Thou wast not taught by the Father, but by thy own Godhead, which is of the same Nature with that of the Father.*

Think

Think you, that the Disciples did, or could understand him, in such an Equivocal Sense, contrary to his plain Words ? Tell me you that can satisfy your own Minds in affirming what Christ denies, how I may do so too ? Will you tell me, as is usual, That all these things are truly denied of him, according to his Human Nature, but false according to his Divine Nature ? What is this, but saying, that our Truth-speaking Lord did, with an Asseveration, plainly deny of himself, that which was plainly true of himself. He was not Two Selves, but One Self ; therefore what was true of his *one Self*, could not be denied of his *other Self*. Did he, at any time, so much as intimate, that he was a second Spirit, or God of the same Nature with him that Sanctified and Sent him ? Are not all his Denials, and all his Affirmations, all his Words, and all his Works, tending mainly to this End, even to prove that he was the *Sent of God*, that he was *Taught of God* ; that God was *in him*, and *with him* ; that God *anointed him* with the *Holy Ghost*, and Power ; that he did miraculous Works by the Finger of God, and not by any diabolical Power ?

If you think to Expound away our Lord's Words, by saying, He could, of himself,

himself, do no no miraculous Work without the Concurrence of his Father ; even *that* shews, that he was not an almighty Nature. But he says more, *I speak not of my self, but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the Works.* Will you be so bold, as to Affirm what our Lord Denies, when he never, by any thing, that he said, gave you the least Ground for so doing ?

Tell me, I beseech you, my Brethren, what you mean by the Term *G O D* ? Your Words imply, that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is God in the highest Sense ; but the Holy Scriptures tells us, in as plain Words, as possible, and in many Places, that *that God is One*, and it says, *There is none other God but One* : How then can the Son of *this One God*, be *that One God*, as a Spirit or Person distinct from the Father ? Tell me conscientiously ! But you say, the Son and the Spirit are of the *same Nature* with the Father, which is an Expression no where found in the Scripture, and of a very doubtful Meaning ; and the requiring of it now, and never before, as necessary to my *Communion* with you, I take to be contrary to the second *Principle of our Church*, mentioned above.

For

For the Son to be of the same Nature with the Father, is to be one Almighty, only Good and all-knowing Spirit, or Mind, as the Father is another, and the Holy Ghost a third; that is (in the best of my Judgment) that they are Three Gods of the same Nature, which is contrary to all sound Reason, and to the current of Scripture. But I dare not, I can't believe, in contradiction to the Holy Jesus, that he is what he denies himself to be.

As *First*, That he is *Almighty*; I have shewed, that he most solemnly denies it of himself.

Secondly, That he is *all-Good*, or *only Good*, or *Good* in the highest sense; he asserts that of One only, in distinction from himself; for he says, in answer to him that call'd him *Good Master*, *There is none* [i. e. no Person, or Spirit] *GOOD but One*, that is GOD. If so, then, either the Father, or he, must not be Good in the highest sense; for there is but One Person, or Spirit, that is so. *Mat. 19. 17.*

Thirdly, As to the Nature, or Attribute of *All-knowing*, or *only Wise*, the Father (I think all will confess) is, and always was, the only Wise, or All-knowing Spirit; but the Son does expressly tell his Disciples, That there was somewhat, to wit, *The day and hour of Judgment*,

ment, which he himself did not know, but *the Father only*. Compare *Mat. 24. 36.* with *Mark 13. 32.* Must I now, in contradiction to our Lord, believe and assert, That he was of the same all-knowing Nature with the Father, and did know the Day and Hour, which the Father only knew? I dread those Thoughts.

Will you now fly to the Distinction of Two Natures, the Humane and Divine; and say, That these Denials are to be understood of the Son according to his Human Nature, but the contrary is to be Asserted of him according to his Divine Nature? But do you not say also, That he is but One Person, or Spirit? And supposing him to have Two Natures, as you say, will it consist with Truth, and that Plainness, Integrity, and Honesty, that was incumbent on him, that was raised up in the Family of *David*, and sent to teach Mankind the knowledge of God, in order to their eternal Salvation; can it become that Person flatly to deny such things of himself, which understood in the plain sense, lead Men into damnable Error? Shall I charge this Holy Person, (to the Truth of whose Doctrine God his Father bore Witness, by Miracles, Wonders, and Signs, which he did *by him*) with denying those things of himself, which were properly

properly true of himself; and with giving us, by that denial, an invincible occasion to deny him to be the Almighty, only Good, and All-Knowing Spirit, or Person, whom you say we ought to Worship as such; or forfeit our Eternal Happiness? I am amaz'd in the Consideration of this! But what has our Lord said in his Gospel, which gives you sufficient ground to believe, he *meant* otherwise than he *said*, in a Matter of the highest Importance? It is Plain-Dealing in any Person to deny that of himself simply, because it does not agree to him according to some inconsiderable Parts; tho' it agrees to him according to a thousand more considerable Parts, or his Whole. As for Example, Can a strong Man say with Truth, I solemnly profess to you, I can't of *my Self* lift one Hundred Weight: But he means, I cannot do it with *my little Finger*; but he can easily do it with the full Strength of all his Parts, or whole Body? Would any one take this for a plain Truth, and not for downright Equivocation? But what has our Lord said, in Affirmation of what he in those Sayings denies. I do not know that any Saying out of his Mouth is alledged, which doth, with any probability, or good shew, Argue it; tho I know that divers Texts are forc'd to serve in
that

that Cause. But you'll say, his Apostles, and inspir'd Writers, say many things to that purpose.

I answer, *First*, It's most unreasonable to urge any thing obscurely spoken by the Servants, in Contradiction to what is plainly denied by the Master; and therefore, all things of that kind must be understood with Consistence to what their Master has said.

Secondly, I say, That all that is alledged of that sort, may, and is fairly agreeing with what Christ himself has said.

Thirdly, That all things that either Jesus himself hath said, or done, or his Disciples, have no higher Tendency than this, *viz.* To prove that *Jesus of Nazareth, was a Man approved of God, by Miracles, Wonders and Signs, which God did by him in the midst of the Jews; that him God hath rais'd up, and therefore that all the House of Israel, [and consequently all other People] should know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom the [Jews] Crucified, both Lord and Christ, see Acts 2. 23, 24, 32, 36.*

Which is the Sum of the first Sermon preached by the Apostle Peter, after his having received the Holy Ghost; by which there were made Believers, and added to the Church above three Thousand

sand Souls. Is here any Tittle concerning
Christ's being a Second Person, or Divine
 Spirit, of the same Nature with the Fa-
 ther? Had not the Atticles in *St. Peter's*
 Sermon been sufficient, was it not neces-
 sary that he should have taught them
 the most *fundamental Article* concerning
Christ, otherwise how could these three
 thousand Souls be Baptized in the Name
 of *Jesus Christ*, and added to the Church,
 whilst they were wholly ignorant of his
 being of the same Divine Nature, or Es-
 sence with the Father? But even *Jesus*
 himself had said, in his solemn Prayer to
 his Father, a little before his Death, *This*
is Eternal Life, that they [to whom I
 should give Eternal Life] *might know*
Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ,
whom thou hast sent. As if he should say,
 in order to Eternal Life, what is neces-
 sary to be known and acknowledged con-
 cerning the Father, is, *That He is the*
only true God; and concerning *Jesus*
Christ, is, That He is He, whom the Father,
the true God, hath Sent. To this agrees,
 that which the Apostle *Paul* says, in the
 Word of Faith, which they Preach'd,
 namely, *If thou shalt confess with thy*
Mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe
in thine Heart, that God hath rais'd him
from the Dead, thou shalt be saved. Rom.
 10. 8, 9.

When

When I read the History of what *Jesus* both said and did, I find his Divine Doctrine and Miracles directed to this End, namely, To prove, that he was the *Messias*, or *Christ*, or Anointed, or Son of God, or Sent of God: But no Intimation of his being a Person, or Spirit of the same Nature with the Father, whose Son, whose Christ he was. * If you please to consult those Texts at bottom, you will find that in the Gospel of St. *John* only, our Lord *Jesus* is said to be Sent of God, or the Father, *three* and *thirty times*, and as many times distinguish'd from God the Father in the Holy Scripture, by the Title *Lord*, which was confer'd upon him as a Reward of his Obedience, as appears, *Phil.* 2. 9, 10, 11. And in the same Gospel he is said, Chap. 16. 36. to be *Sanctified and sent into the World*. For you know, that before his being sent into the World to Preach, he was Anointed with the Holy Ghost, which descended upon him at his Baptism. *John* 17. 18. *Jesus* saith, *As thou [Father] hast Sent me into the World,*

* *John* 3. 17. and 34. Chap. 4. 34. c. 5. 30. c. 6. 38. c. 5. 34. and 36. 37, 38. c. 6. 29. and 46. 45. c. 7. 16. and 28. c. 8. 26. and 29. 16. 18. c. 12. 49. c. 9. 4. c. 10. 35. c. 11. 42. c. 12. 44. and 45. c. 13. 20. c. 15. 47. c. 16. 5. c. 17. 3. and 8. 18. 23. 25. c. 20. 21.

even so have I also sent them into the World. For they also, before their being Sent, received from Christ, the Holy Ghost, in cloven Tongues of Fire, as he from the Father, the same, in a Bodily shape like a Dove. He commends his Disciples to the Father upon this Account, that *They have believed that Thou hast sent me.* John 17. 8. He saith further, *The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same Works that I do, bear Witness of me, that the Father hath Sent me.* John 5. 36. They did not bear Witness, that he was a Second Person, or Spirit, of the same Nature, or Kind with the Father, but that the Father, *his God*, had sent him. And when he was comforting his Disciples, upon the account of his leaving them, he tells them, *If ye loved me, ye would rejoyce, because I said I go unto the Father.* Why so, Lord, art not thou of the same Almighty Nature with the Father? No, no, I tell you, *My Father is greater than I.* In fine, Christ has said nothing in any of the Evangelists, which doth not agree with, or confirm those Negations of his, *The Son can do nothing of himself, the Son doth not know, but the Father only, none is God but One.* Shall I now, in contradiction to the Father, and the Son, affirm the contrary?

D

As

As concerning the Holy Spirit, if you mean that *One Spirit*, in Number, which God, or the Father is, when it's said by our Lord, *God is a Spirit*, I do not deny but the Holy Spirit is God, in the most perfect Sense; but if you mean, that the Father, and the Holy Spirit, are two Spirits; whereof the one is sent from Heaven by the other; whereof the one is given and poured out by the other; whereof the one heareth from another, what he should speak, and speaketh not of himself; whereof the one maketh Intercession to the other, and the like Differences; I deny there are two such Holy Spirits, in the most perfect Sense, whereof the one is of the same Nature with the Father, the other the Father himself. For I can't yet distinguish those from two Gods, but I am willing to learn.

In the Conclusion of this first Article of the Charge, you say, *I affirm that the Lord Jesus, and the Holy Spirit, are only Creatures.* I answer, It's disingenuous and un-brotherly to charge a Brother with an ill-looking Consequence, which you draw from his Words, and which he does not assert, but deny; for I have already shewn, that in some Sense I affirm the second and third Persons to be God, and not only Creatures; and I shall

shall further shew it in my Answer to the third Article.

Your Second Article is, *That I deny the Pre-existence of our Redeemer before his Incarnation, affirming he had no Actual nor Personal Being, till he was conceiv'd in the Womb of the Virgin.*

Here, not minding Scripture, but Scholastick Terms, you Charge me with denying the *Pre existence* of our Redeemer; but you do not mean by Redeemer, him that is called Redeemer in the Holy Scriptures, (and that near twenty times) but you mean *Him* by whom *that* Redeemer has redeemed us. But how comes the Denial of Christ's *Pre-existence*, to be another Error contrary to Scripture? Must he that denies the *Deity* of Christ, deny his *Pre-existence*? No sure; for he may be an *Arrian*, confess his *Pre-existence*, and deny his *Deity*!

So then, it seems, this Article is, to see whether I am an *Arrian*, or not; which if I were, you may remember there was a Time when all the World, or the whole Church, was *Arrian*, except *Athanasius*, and one or two Bishops more. It seems, if you had been

in those Days, you would have *Excommunicated* all the World with me, tho' I confess, had I liv'd then, I would have *Communicated* with them, notwithstanding that Doctrine. Sure I am, our deceased *Pastor*, who was in the same Sentiment, would not have scrupled it.

Your Third Charge is, *Denying the Doctrine of the blessed Trinity, in the Unity of the God-Head, as generally received by Christians.*

This Article seems to be added to encrease the Number ; for my Brethren (except some that study *Policy* more than *Divinity*) could not be ignorant, that there are different Forms of the *Doctrine of the blessed Trinity*, as I observed before ; and that the several Parties are very numerous, and do each of 'em Challenge the *catholick Church*, that is, the *generality of Christians*, to be on their Side ; condemning the contrary Doctrine to be *Heretical*.

Besides, I have sufficiently prov'd in, this *Answer*, That the Doctrine of my Brethren, in these *Articles* against me, is that which the Vice-Chancellor, and Heads of the University of Oxford, have decreed to be *false, impious, and heretical,*

tical, contrary to the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, and Church of England. And in that condemned Sense it is, that I do Deny the Doctrine of the Trinity. So that in charging me with contradicting the Holy Scriptures in this behalf, they have (in the Judgment of the learned University of Oxford) condemned the Catholick Church, and Church of England; and in suspending me from their Communion, they do in the Reason of the Thing, suspend from their Communion the generality of Christians. For, my Brethren, I am convinc'd by the said learned Universities, and others, that the learned Fathers, such as St. Augustine, and the modern Divines, as Mr. Hooker, Dr. Owen, Dr. Wallis, and Mr. Baxter, did not, and do not believe and hold such Trinity in Unity, as three actual and personal Beings in the God-head, as my Brethren charge me with the Denial of; but only three Properties, or Modes, in the one infinite Being; or the Spirit that is God.

But, in short, the Model of Articles against me only shows, there is more of worldly Policy, than Religion, in this Prosecution, there being sufficient Reasons to believe it.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, and Lastly, You charge me with *Frequently shewing an unbecoming, and irreverend Behaviour in publick Worship, when Divine Glory hath been ascribed to the Son and Holy Spirit, together with the Father.*

To this I Answer, *First*, That to give divine Glory (that is, the same Glory) to the Son, and Holy Spirit, distinctly and expressly with the Father, is not to *hold the form of sound Words*, but a manifest preferring humane Inventions in the Worship of God, before the Words and Forms of giving Glory in the Holy Scriptures, which abound in such Forms.

Secondly, Our Lord hath taught us, That with the highest Worship we ought not to Worship any Person, or Spirit, but *him*, who is *his* God and Father, and *our* God and Father; whom only he Worshipped, and we ought to Worship: But that we ought to Honour himself, the Son as the Father, because the *Father has committed all Judgment to the Son*: He that so *Honoureth the Son*, *Honoureth the Father that sent him*. But to give the same divine Glory to the Holy Ghost, as a distinct Person or Spirit

rit from the Father, is never taught in Scripture, either by Precept, or Example.

Thirdly, I have shewn, that to give Glory to God the Father, to God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, if we understand them as three infinite Persons, or Spirits, (as they are vulgarly understood) is, in the Judgment of the Learned, *Impious*.

How can I then be blamed, for giving sometimes, an open Dislike of such *Doxologies*, as well for the clearing of my own Conscience, as to provoke my Brethren to consider, *That the Times of Ignorance God winketh at, but when Light appears, it will turn to our Condemnation to reject it?*

Oh! my Brethren, I heartily bless God, that he has been pleased to make me to know, and Believe, that He is *One Person* in the Vulgar Sense; that is, one most perfect Spirit, Mind, intelligent Substance, or Being (however *three* in the Scholastick Sense) for by this Knowledge I am made capable of Loving, Worshipping, and Serving him with all my Heart, as the only and entire Object of my Service and Devotion.

I am glad I have occasion to make this Confession to you : I hope it may issue in your clearer Knowledge of the Father, the only true God, and of him whom he hath sent, *Jesus Christ*, whom he has exalted, and made Lord for his own Glory.

Now to God only wise be Glory, thro' Jesus Christ, for ever. Amen.

F I N I S.

